



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/710,143	11/10/2000	Erin M. Bourke-Dunphy	MS160275.1	4603
27195 75	90 01/13/2004		EXAM	INER
AMIN & TUROCY, LLP			TANG, KUO LIANG J	
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CLEVELAND, OH 44114			2122	9
			DATE MAILED: 01/13/2004	4 <i>O</i>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		PILE,			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
·· Advisory Action	09/710,143	BOURKE-DUNPHY ET AL.			
·	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Kuo-Liang J Tang	2122			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS API Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: ( condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in			
PERIOD FOR RI	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ad event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The day	han SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP			
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exter 87 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortene b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nsion and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	•	•			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	pecause:				
(a)  they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);			
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	terially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.			
3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ction(s):				
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	d be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment			
☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:				
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: 1-21.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.					
☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
0. ☐ Other:					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

÷

. . 💘

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments filed 12/23/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "installation location" which should be entailed "location" as described per specification as pg. 2, In. 25-26, 31-32 and page 3, In. 2-4; ) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

TUAN DAM SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER